

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/612,576	Applicant(s) BECHARA ET AL.
	Examiner Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	Art Unit 1713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim.

(3) _____.

(2) Dr. Donald Drummond 

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tanaka et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative indicated that the novelty in the invention was the presence of the amine functionality with the hydroxyl group in the ester monomer. The Examiner pointed out that the claims, as presently written, do not require the first member of the group from which the ester monomer is selected to contain the amine functionality. Only the dicarboxylic acid ester member requires this amine functionality as presently written. The Examiner suggested that the claims be amended to more specifically claim what applicant is intending to acquire protection for.